

REMARKS

The Office Action dated March 4, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 12, 22 and 25 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 12-26 are presently pending, of which claims 12, 22 and 25 are independent claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 12, 22 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for lack of antecedent basis. Applicant has amended those claims to correct these minor claim language informalities. In addition, Applicant has amended claim 22 to remove the redundant claim recitation "and the" based on the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, all claims are believed to be in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,879,838) in view of Hasebe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,946,991). The Office Action took the position that all of the claimed subject matter recited in claims 12-26 is taught or suggested by Rankin or Hasebe. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Rankin does not teach or suggest "the estimated location of the mobile device used to determine the at least one prayer time is based on the coverage area of the at least one base station and a current cell identification (Cell ID) parameter assigned to the mobile

device”, as recited, in part, in independent claim 12 and similarly in independent claim 22 and 25. The Office Action alleged that the “registration with the cell”, which is disclosed on column 5, lines 57-60 of Rankin, is comparable to using a Cell ID parameter to determine an estimated location of the mobile device and to determine at least one prayer time. Applicant disagrees with the Office Action’s alleged interpretation of Rankin, and submits that Rankin fails to disclose using a “Cell ID” parameter anywhere in the specification. For at least the reason that Rankin is silent regarding a “Cell ID”, Rankin also fails to teach estimating the location of a mobile device based on the coverage area of the base station and “a current cell identification (Cell ID) parameter”, as recited in the claims.

Rankin discloses that the “registration with the cell” may be, for example, an event or occurrence that triggers a map updating procedure (see column 5, lines 57-60 of Rankin). The map includes location based information services and may be transmitted to the mobile device 100 (see column 4, lines 38-42 of Rankin). Furthermore, the map is transferred to the mobile device 100 once the location of the mobile device has been determined (see same portion of Rankin). Claim 12 clearly recites “using a Cell ID parameter to determine an estimated location of the mobile device.” Therefore, by having the “registration with the cell” trigger the map update procedure implies that the location of the mobile device 100 is already known prior to having the map sent to the mobile device 100. Neither the map update nor the related cell registration procedures disclosed in Rankin are comparable to determining an estimated location of the mobile device based on a Cell ID parameter.

In addition to the above noted deficiencies of Rankin with respect to the claimed features, the cell registration procedure does not disclose using a Cell ID. The Cell ID parameter is well known to those of ordinary skill in the art as a cellular communications system parameter used to identify base stations operating in a cell, and to also identify which mobile stations are operating under a particular base station. Rankin does not disclose a Cell ID for any purpose. Because Rankin is silent with respect to a Cell ID, Rankin certainly does not disclose using a Cell ID to estimate the location of the mobile device, such that the estimated location of the mobile device is determined “based on the coverage area of the at least one base station and a current cell identification (Cell ID) parameter assigned to the mobile device.

Assuming, for example, that the mobile device of the present invention is receiving information other than “prayer time” information, then in the absence of the specific type of information received by the mobile station, the claims still provide that the Cell ID is a parameter that is used to determine an estimated location of the mobile device so that the specific type of information provided to the mobile device is based on the estimated location of the mobile device. In other words, the information provided to the mobile device is location specific and the specific estimated location that is determined and used for sending the location specific information to the mobile device is based on at least two parameters which include the coverage area of the at least one base station and the Cell ID parameter assigned to the mobile device. Rankin simply fails to disclose a Cell ID, and because Rankin is silent regarding such a feature, Rankin surely does not disclose a Cell ID used to perform the operations recited in any of the

independent claims 12, 22 and 25. Furthermore, Hasebe does not cure the deficiencies of Rankin with respect to the claims.


Hasebe also fails to teach or suggest “the estimated location of the mobile device used to determine the at least one prayer time is based on the coverage area of the at least one base station and a current cell identification (Cell ID) parameter assigned to the mobile device”, as recited, in part, in independent claim 12 and similarly in independent claim 22 and 25. Hasebe is directed solely to a direction finding method that helps users locate the direction of Mecca so that they may satisfy face the correct direction while performing their Muslim prayers. Hasebe uses GPS to determine the location of Mecca and to send that information to a user of a mobile terminal. Praying in the direction of Mecca is a separate requirement of Muslim prayers, and one that is not of concern to the subject matter recited in the claims of the present application. Hasebe does not cure the deficiencies of Rankin with respect to the claims.

Therefore, Rankin and Hasebe, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the subject matter recited in independent claims 12, 22 and 25. By virtue of dependency claims 13-21 and 23-25 are also allowable over Rankin and Hasebe. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claim recites subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited art. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 12-26 be withdrawn, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

With best regards,



Kamran Emdadi
Registration No. 58,823

Emdadi Patent Law
2025 Beacon Place
Reston VA 20191
571.437.7660

Date: June 3, 2008